

REMARKS

Claim Objections

The amendments filed herewith cure the claim objections.

35 U.S.C. § 112

The amendments filed herewith cure the § 112 rejection.

New claims 16 and 17 provide alternative language for the subject matter of claims 8 and 9 and are presented to further resolve 112 issues raised in the office action. Claim 9, as amended, covers the answering computer that had provided the hash ID with modified content executing further searching. New claim 16 covers the other person's computer doing further searching.

35 U.S.C. § 103

With the 37 CFR 1.131 declaration filed herewith, Applicant swears behind the Schechter reference. The Schechter reference was published on May 29, 2003. As shown in the Exhibits A and C, and their English translations Exhibits B and D, the inventors of the present application had conceived of the invention as claimed at least as early as October 16, 2002. These facts show that the inventors had completed the invention commensurate with the extent of the invention as claimed presently. See, in re Wakefield, 422 F2d 897 (CCPA 1970) and MPEP 715.02. Accordingly, the Schechter reference is not prior art. The Schechter reference not being prior art, it cannot support or be used in a §103 obviousness rejection.

The last page of Exhibit A is an email attaching the Power Point presentation of Exhibit A. It is dated October 16, 2002. Portions of Exhibit C are redacted. These redacted portions correspond to other, unrelated proprietary data of the applicants. Slide 9 of Exhibit C also records the date of October 20, 2002.

The Menezes reference cannot support a § 103 obviousness rejection by itself. Of course, as noted in the office action, it does not teach multiple limitations of the presently pending claims. Secondly, even if it did, or, in the alternative, even if a qualifying prior art reference besides Schechter is found to disclose some claim limitations, the Menezes reference is inapposite and fails to teach any limitations of the presently pending claims. The Menezes reference is a cryptography text. The cited portions are teaching methods for attacking hash *functions*. The presently pending claims recite hash *IDs*. Hash functions are not hash IDs. Accordingly, the Menezes reference does not teach, suggest or motivate any limitations in the presently pending claims. Moreover, under KSR analysis, it does not disclose the elements claimed (hash IDs) and therefore cannot disclose that those old elements are performing in the present claims the old functions as taught by the Menezes reference. Therefore, Menezes cannot support a 103 obviousness rejection under KSR v. Teleflex analysis, either individually or in combination with a proper prior art document showing what Schechter had shown, even if such a document exists.

INTERVIEW REQUESTED

Applicant requests a telephone interview.

Conclusion

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Robert C. Haldiman, Reg. No. 45,437
Husch & Eppenberger, LLC
190 Carondelet Plaza
St. Louis, MO 63105
314-480-1641
314-480-1505 FAX